



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/986,863	11/13/2001	Wen Hong Liu	50103-421/STL 3057	6031

7590 09/05/2003
MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY
600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096

6	EXAMINER
---	----------

RESAN, STEVAN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	1773

DATE MAILED: 09/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	09/986,863		Applicant(s)	LIU ET AL.	
Examiner	Stevan A. Resan		Art Unit	1773	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 June 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 7-15 and 23-25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-6, 16-22, 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3)<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4)<input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____. 5)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6)<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |
|--|--|

Art Unit: 1773

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Applicant's confirmation of the election of Group I, claims 1-6, 16-22, and 26 in Paper No. 5 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).
3. Claims 1-5, 16-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Mahoney et al US 6086962 for the reasons of record.
4. Claims 6, 21, 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mahoney et al as applied to claims 1, 16 for the reasons of record.
5. Claims 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Usuki et al US 5869186 for the reasons of record.
6. Applicant's arguments filed 18 June 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that the articles of Mahoney et al upon which the examiner relies for inherency have only the same amount of diamondlike sp₃ bonding and do not display all of the properties or characteristics of the present ly claimed films or products.

However the Examiner is relying upon the specific examples of Mahoney et al as having a structure that would exhibit the claimed properties and therefore the Examiner is on firm ground with respect to an anticipation rejection based upon inherency.

Applicants argue that the examiner has also disregarded the clear teachings of the disadvantages or shortcomings of ion beam deposited ("IBD") C:H films.

In response the Examiner points out that the process of Mahoney et al is not a conventional ion beam process but one which results in a far thinner, harder, more wear resistant carbon film to protect a magnetic recording medium. When acetylene-argon is used (as in example D) it appears that the film would fall in the range of electrical resistance claimed due to its high deposition rate which would not be possible if a insulating carbon was being deposited..

If applicants disagree with the examiner they are invited to present comparative evidence with example D of Mahoney et al. in order to demonstrate that example D does not inherently possess the same structure as applicant's film and thus overcome the anticipation rejection..

Applicants are reminded that the Examiner cannot give weight to process limitations unless it has been shown that they result in a patently distinct article. The aforementioned comparative evidence would also enable the examiner to give weight to the process limitations.

7. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 1773

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stevan A. Resan whose telephone number is (703) 308-4287. The examiner can normally be reached on Tues-Fri from 7:30AM to 6:00PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Thibodeau, can be reached on (703) 308-2367. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-7718



STEVAN A. RESAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER